arXiv:1104.4853v1 [gr-qc] 26 Apr 2011

Orbital effects of a monochromatic plane gravitational wave with ultra-low frequency incident on a gravitationally bound two-body system

Lorenzo Iorio[1]
Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca (M.I.U.R.). Permanent address for correspondence: Viale Unità di Italia 68, 70125, Bari (BA), Italy.

`lorenzo.iorio@libero.it`

Received ______________________; accepted ______________________

ABSTRACT

We analytically compute the long-term variations of all the standard six Keplerian orbital elements $a, e, I, \Omega, \varpi, \mathcal{M}$ of a test particle orbiting a central body acted upon by an incident monochromatic plane gravitational wave. We assume that the characteristic size of the perturbed two-body system is much smaller than the wavelength of the wave. Moreover, we also suppose that the wave's frequency ν_g is much smaller than the particle's orbital one n. We make neither a priori assumptions about the direction of the wavevector $\boldsymbol{k}$ nor on the orbital geometry of the planet. We find that, while the semi-major axis a is left unaffected, the eccentricity e, the inclination I, the longitude of the ascending node Ω, the longitude of pericenter ϖ and the mean anomaly $\mathcal{M}$ undergo non-vanishing long-term changes of the form $d\Psi/dt = \mathfrak{G}(\mathcal{K}_{ij}; e, I, \Omega, \omega), \Psi = e, I, \Omega, \varpi, \mathcal{M}$ where $\mathcal{K}_{ij},\ i, j = 1, 2, 3$ are the coefficients of the tidal matrix K. They are not secular trends because of the slow modulation introduced by K and by the orbital elements themselves. Our calculation holds, in general, for any gravitationally bound two-body system whose characteristic frequency n is much larger than the frequency ν_g of the external wave. It is also valid for a generic perturbation of tidal type with constant coefficients over timescales of the order of the orbital period of the perturbed particle.

Subject headings: gravitation; gravitational waves; celestial mechanics

1. Introduction

Gravitational waves are a key theoretical prediction of the Einstein's theory of gravitation. Indeed, since the general theory of relativity relies upon the Lorentz invariance, which carries with it the concept of a limiting speed for interactions, the existence of gravitational waves is a natural consequence of it (Einstein 1916, 1918). Apart from the indirect evidence of their existence inferred from the orbital decay rate of the binary pulsar PSR B1913+16 (Hulse & Taylor 1975), a direct measurement of them is still lacking. See, e.g., Cerdonio (2003); Giazotto (2008); Fairhurst et al. (2011) for recent reviews of the status of gravitational wave detection. The consequences of detecting gravitational waves for physics, astrophysics, and cosmology would be certainly remarkable; see, e.g., Sathyaprakash & Schutz (2009). The role of a direct detection of the gravitational waves for general relativity and extended theories of gravity has been recently pointed out by Corda (2009a,b). Let us recall that the gravitational wave spectrum spans a wavelength range of over 18 orders of magnitude, encompassing a very broad range of physics and astrophysics (Prince et al. 2010). The frequencies in the range $10^1 - 10^4$ Hz are the targets of several ground-based detectors like, LIGO (Abramovici et al. 1992; Abbott et al. 2009), VIRGO (Bradaschia et al. 1990; Vinet 1993; Acernese et al. 2004), TAMA (Tsubono 1995; Takahashi et al. 2004; Arai et al. 2008), GEO (Danzmann et al. 1992; Grote et al. 2008), etc. The space-based LISA mission (Shaddock 2008) aims to detect gravitational waves in the frequency range $10^{-5} - 1$ Hz, while accurate timing measurements of pulsars may detect signals in the range $10^{-9} - 10^{-7}$ Hz (Kopeikin 1997; Hand 2010; Jenet et al. 2011).

In this paper, we will analytically work out the long-term variations of all the six standard Keplerian orbital elements of a solar system planet due to the action of an externally incident monochromatic plane gravitational wave in the green-red[1] part of the spectrum, i.e. with frequency $\nu_g \ll 10^{-7} - 10^{-10}$ Hz. Such kinds of gravitational waves are important since they carry information about how galaxies and black holes co-evolved over the history of the Universe (Plowman et al. 2010; Sesana et al. 2011), the early universe and related exotic physical processes like, e.g., inflation and cosmic strings, and possible physics beyond the standard model of particles and fields (Vilenkin 1981; Rubakov et al. 1982; Fabbri & Pollock 1983; Hogan 1986; Grishchuk 1993). Concerning the possible existence of a background of gravitational waves dating back to the origin of the Universe, see, e.g., Weber (1961); Wheeler (1962); Zel'dovich & Novikov (1975); Carr (1980), and the discussion in Mashhoon et al. (1981). The effects of incident gravitational waves on the orbital motion of gravitationally bound systems were considered by several authors with a variety of different approaches and approximations for various features of both the waves and the orbits themselves (Bertotti 1973; Rudenko 1975; Mashhoon 1978; Futamase & Matsuda 1979; Mashhoon 1979; Turner 1979; Grishchuk & Polnarev 1980; Mashhoon et al. 1981; Linet

---

[1] See Figure 1 of Prince et al. (2010).

1982a,b; Nelson & Chau 1982; Ivashchenko 1987; Kochkin & Sbytov 1987; Chicone et al. 1996a,b; Ismaiel & Saad 2011). The idea of using the solar system to try to detect a stochastic background of gravitational waves of wavelengths much larger than about 1 au was first suggested by Bertotti (1973). We wish to remark that the calculation presented here are, actually, of quite general interest. On the one hand, as far as the search for gravitational waves is concerned, our results may be extended also to spacecraft-based missions in the solar system like ASTROD-GW (Ni 2009; Men et al. 2010), constituted of a number of probes in wide heliocentric orbits, and LISA (Povoleri & Kemble 2006; Xia et al. 2010) envisaging the use of three spacecrafts orbiting the Sun at 1 au distance in a quasi-equilateral triangle formation 20 deg behind the Earth. It is also the case of recalling that the possibilities offered by Doppler tracking of interplanetary drag-free spacecraft to detect cosmological gravitational waves with wavelength of the order of, or larger than 1 au were studied in the past (Anderson 1971; Mashhoon & Grishchuk 1980; Bertotti & Carr 1980); for a recent review, see Armstrong (2006) and references therein. Moreover, our calculations are valid, in principle, also for other natural systems like extrasolar planets[2] (Torres et al. 2008) many of which have orbital frequencies of the order of 10^{-4} Hz, orbiting their parent stars at distances as small as $\simeq 0.01$ au. In such cases, our findings are technically valid for waves with higher frequencies with respect the solar system ones: indeed, they might be as high as about[3] 10^{-6} corresponding to the green-light blue part of the spectrum in Figure 1 of Prince et al. (2010). On the other hand, our results are not necessarily limited to the very-low frequency waves case, being valid for any tidal force with constant (over particle's characteristic timescales) matrix coefficients as well, independently of its physical origin.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we will discuss the analytical form of the acceleration experienced by the test particle due to an incident monochromatic plane gravitational wave traveling along a generic direction. We will also consider the simplified cases of a gravitational wave moving along the z axis, as it is a choice widely adopted in literature, and in the reference $\{x, y\}$ plane. In Section 3 we will analytically work out the long-period changes occurring in the particle's orbital motion in the case of wave's frequencies much smaller than the orbital ones. We will not make any simplifying assumptions about the inclination and the eccentricity of the orbit. In Section 4 we briefly review some of the approaches followed in literature. Section 5 is devoted to the conclusions.

---

[2] See http://exoplanet.eu/ on the WEB.

[3] However, for waves with such relatively high frequencies other facilities like LISA would be available: if they will finally become operative at the expected level of accuracy, they would likely surpass the possibilities offered by the extrasolar planets.

2. The acceleration imparted on an orbiting planet by a passing monochromatic plane gravitational wave

The action of an incoming gravitational wave on a planet of the solar system is of tidal type with respect to a suitably constructed local inertial frame, represented by a Fermi coordinate system $\{x, y, z, t\}$ (Fermi 1922; Levi-Civita 1926; Synge 1960), whose origin is located at the Sun's position. In general, a tidal acceleration $\boldsymbol{A}$ experienced by a slowly moving test particle due to an external curved spacetime metric can be written in terms of the "electric" components $R^i{}_{0j0},\ i, j = 1, 2, 3$ of the local Riemann curvature tensor R as (Pirani 1956)

$$\ddot{x}^i \simeq -R^i{}_{0j0} x^j \doteq \sum_{j=1}^{3} \mathcal{K}_{ij} x^j, i =, 1, 2, 3, \tag{1}$$

where we introduced the coefficients $\mathcal{K}_{ij},\ i, j = 1, 2, 3$ of the tidal matrix K. In this case, the geodesic deviation equation (Levi-Civita 1926; Synge 1926) is the standard Jacobi equation. In general, other non-linear terms involving also the components of the test particle's velocity along with other components of the Riemann tensor occur from the generalized Jacobi equation (Hodgkinson 1972; Mashhoon 1975, 1977; Chicone & Mashhoon 2002): we will neglect them because of their smallness.

In the linearized weak-field and slow-motion approximation (Padmanabhan 2010), and for the case of a propagating gravitational wave, one has[4]

$$R^i{}_{0j0} \simeq -\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2 h_{ij}}{\partial t^2}, i, j = 1, 2, 3. \tag{2}$$

Recall that, in general, the symmetric tensor $\overline{\mathsf{h}}$ (Padmanabhan 2010)

$$\overline{h}^{\mu\nu} \doteq h^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\eta^{\mu\nu} h,\ \mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3, \tag{3}$$

where $h^{\mu\nu},\ \mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$ are small ($|h^{\mu\nu}| \ll 1,\ \mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$) corrections of the metric tensor $\eta^{\mu\nu},\ \mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$ of the flat Minkowskian spacetime, and h is the trace of h, is a solution of the linear wave equation in the vacuum

$$\Box \overline{h}^{\mu\nu} = 0,\ \mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3, \tag{4}$$

with the gauge condition

$$\frac{\partial \overline{h}^{\mu\nu}}{\partial x^\mu} = 0,\ \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3. \tag{5}$$

---

[4] In general, also the second derivatives of h_{00} and $h_{0i},\ i = 1, 2, 3$ are present in $R^i{}_{0j0},\ i, j = 1, 2, 3$, but in the case of a gravitational wave they do not propagate (Padmanabhan 2010) because of gauge freedom (transverse traceless gauge, or TT gauge).

In the TT gauge, it turns out that $\overline{\mathsf{h}} = \mathsf{h}$. In the case of a propagating plane wave, of the form[5]

$$h^{\mu\nu} = \mathrm{Re}\left\{\chi^{\mu\nu} \exp\left[i\left(\nu_g t - \boldsymbol{k} \cdot \boldsymbol{r}\right)\right]\right\},\ \mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3, \tag{6}$$

the fact that both h_{00} and $h_{0i},\ i = 1, 2, 3$ vanish in the TT gauge implies that the tidal matrix K is not only symmetric, but also traceless. Thus, it has five independent components, so that the acceleration $\boldsymbol{A}$ of eq. (1) felt by a test particle becomes, quite generally,

$$\left\{\begin{array}{lcl} A_x & = & \mathcal{K}_{xx}x + \mathcal{K}_{xy}y + \mathcal{K}_{xz}z, \\ \\ A_y & = & \mathcal{K}_{xy}x + \mathcal{K}_{yy}y + \mathcal{K}_{yz}z, \\ \\ A_z & = & \mathcal{K}_{xz}x + \mathcal{K}_{yz}y - (\mathcal{K}_{xx} + \mathcal{K}_{yy})z. \end{array}\right. \tag{7}$$

In fact, the condition that the force exerted on the particle by the wave is orthogonal to its direction of propagation given by $\hat{\boldsymbol{k}}$ yields three further constraints

$$\left\{\begin{array}{lcl} \mathcal{K}_{xx}\hat{k}_x + \mathcal{K}_{xy}\hat{k}_y + \mathcal{K}_{xz}\hat{k}_z & = & 0, \\ \\ \mathcal{K}_{xy}\hat{k}_x + \mathcal{K}_{yy}\hat{k}_y + \mathcal{K}_{yz}\hat{k}_z & = & 0, \\ \\ \mathcal{K}_{xz}\hat{k}_x + \mathcal{K}_{yz}\hat{k}_y - \left(\mathcal{K}_{xx} + \mathcal{K}_{yy}\right)\hat{k}_z & = & 0, \end{array}\right. \tag{8}$$

so that the independent components of $\mathcal{K}_{ij},\ i, j = 1, 2, 3$ are just two. They have dimensions of T^{-2} and, in the case of eq. (6), are harmonic functions proportional to ν_g^2. Notice that eq. (8) comes just from eq. (5): indeed, for eq. (6) and in the TT gauge eq. (5) reduces to

$$h_{ij}k^j = 0,\ i = 1, 2, 3, \tag{9}$$

which corresponds to eq. (8).

For a wave not traveling in the reference $\{x, y\}$ plane, i.e. for $\hat{k}_z \neq 0$, eq. (8) yields

$$\left\{\begin{array}{lcl} \mathcal{K}_{xz} & = & -\mathcal{K}_{xx}\left(\frac{\hat{k}_x}{\hat{k}_z}\right) - \mathcal{K}_{xy}\left(\frac{\hat{k}_y}{\hat{k}_z}\right), \\ \\ \mathcal{K}_{yy} & = & -\mathcal{K}_{xx}\left(\frac{\hat{k}_x^2+\hat{k}_z^2}{\hat{k}_y^2+\hat{k}_z^2}\right) - 2\mathcal{K}_{xy}\left(\frac{\hat{k}_x\hat{k}_y}{\hat{k}_y^2+\hat{k}_z^2}\right), \\ \\ \mathcal{K}_{yz} & = & \mathcal{K}_{xx}\left[\frac{\hat{k}_y}{\hat{k}_z}\left(\frac{\hat{k}_x^2+\hat{k}_z^2}{\hat{k}_y^2+\hat{k}_z^2}\right)\right] + \mathcal{K}_{xy}\left\{\left(\frac{\hat{k}_x}{\hat{k}_z}\right)\left[\frac{2\hat{k}_y^2}{\left(\hat{k}_y^2+\hat{k}_z^2\right)} - 1\right]\right\}. \end{array}\right. \tag{10}$$

---

[5] In eq. (6) $\chi^{\mu\nu},\ \mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$ represent the gravitational radiation field.

Thus, we pose

$$\left\{\begin{array}{lcl} h_1 & \doteq & \mathcal{K}_{xx}, \\ \\ h_2 & \doteq & \mathcal{K}_{xy} \end{array}\right. \tag{11}$$

for the two independent polarizations of the gravitational wave.

When the wave propagates in the reference $\{x, y\}$ plane, i.e. for $\hat{k}_z = 0$, the second equation in eq. (10) becomes

$$\mathcal{K}_{yy} = -\mathcal{K}_{xx}\left(\frac{\hat{k}_x}{\hat{k}_y}\right)^2 - 2\mathcal{K}_{xy}\left(\frac{\hat{k}_x}{\hat{k}_y}\right), \tag{12}$$

while from eq. (8) it turns out

$$\left\{\begin{array}{lcl} \mathcal{K}_{xy} & = & -\mathcal{K}_{xx}\left(\frac{\hat{k}_x}{\hat{k}_y}\right), \\ \\ \mathcal{K}_{yz} & = & -\mathcal{K}_{xz}\left(\frac{\hat{k}_x}{\hat{k}_y}\right). \end{array}\right. \tag{13}$$

Thus, in this case, we define

$$\left\{\begin{array}{lcl} h_1 & \doteq & \mathcal{K}_{xx}, \\ \\ h_2 & \doteq & \mathcal{K}_{xz}. \end{array}\right. \tag{14}$$

Notice that both eq. (12) and eq. (13) do not hold for a wave traveling along the reference x axis, i.e. for $\hat{k}_y = 0$.

Finally, let us notice that when $\hat{\boldsymbol{k}} = \{\pm 1, 0, 0\}$, eq. (8) tells us that

$$\mathcal{K}_{xx} = \mathcal{K}_{xy} = \mathcal{K}_{xz} = 0, \tag{15}$$

so that it can be posed

$$\left\{\begin{array}{lcl} h_1 & \doteq & \mathcal{K}_{yy}, \\ \\ h_2 & \doteq & \mathcal{K}_{yz}. \end{array}\right. \tag{16}$$

In order to make contact with realistic situations occurring in typical solar system data analyses, we remark that the unit vector $\hat{\boldsymbol{k}}$ can be written, in general, as

$$\left\{\begin{array}{lcl} \hat{k}_x & = & \cos\beta\cos\lambda, \\ \\ \hat{k}_y & = & \cos\beta\sin\lambda, \\ \\ \hat{k}_z & = & \sin\beta \end{array}\right. \tag{17}$$

in terms of the ecliptic latitude β and longitude λ, which are to be considered as unknown. Explicit expressions of the tidal matrix coefficients for a generic wave's incidence can be found in Chicone et al. (1996a). In addition to the amplitudes of the two independent wave's polarizations and of their mutual constant phase difference, they contains β and λ through the angle Θ (Chicone et al. 1996a). It is defined from $\boldsymbol{\hat{k}}\boldsymbol{\cdot}\boldsymbol{\hat{N}} = \cos\Theta$ and $\left|\boldsymbol{\hat{k}}\times\boldsymbol{\hat{N}}\right| = \sin\Theta$, where $\boldsymbol{\hat{N}}$ is the unit vector directed along the test particle's out-of-plane direction (see eq. (31) below) coinciding with the direction of the orbital angular momentum.

Inserting eq. (10), with eq. (17), in eq. (7) yields[6]

$$
\left\{
\begin{array}{rcl}
A_x & = & h_1\left(x - z\cot\beta\cos\lambda\right) + h_2\left(y - z\cot\beta\sin\lambda\right), \\[2ex]
A_y & = & h_1\left\{-y\left(\frac{\sin^2\beta+\cos^2\beta\cos^2\lambda}{\sin^2\beta+\cos^2\beta\sin^2\lambda}\right) + z\left[\frac{\cot\beta\sin\lambda\left(\sin^2\beta+\cos^2\beta\cos^2\lambda\right)}{\sin^2\beta+\cos^2\beta\sin^2\lambda}\right]\right\} + \\[2ex]
 & + & h_2\left[x - y\left(\frac{\cos^2\beta\sin 2\lambda}{\sin^2\beta+\cos^2\beta\sin^2\lambda}\right) - z\cot\beta\cos\lambda\left(\frac{\sin^2\beta-\cos^2\beta\sin^2\lambda}{\sin^2\beta+\cos^2\beta\sin^2\lambda}\right)\right], \\[2ex]
A_z & = & h_1\left\{-x\cot\beta\cos\lambda + y\left[\frac{\cot\beta\sin\lambda\left(\sin^2\beta+\cos^2\beta\cos^2\lambda\right)}{\sin^2\beta+\cos^2\beta\sin^2\lambda}\right] + z\left(\frac{\cos^2\beta\cos 2\lambda}{\sin^2\beta+\cos^2\beta\sin^2\lambda}\right)\right\} + \\[2ex]
 & + & h_2\left[-x\cot\beta\sin\lambda - y\cot\beta\cos\lambda\left(\frac{\sin^2\beta-\cos^2\beta\sin^2\lambda}{\sin^2\beta+\cos^2\beta\sin^2\lambda}\right) + z\left(\frac{\cos^2\beta\sin 2\lambda}{\sin^2\beta+\cos^2\beta\sin^2\lambda}\right)\right].
\end{array}
\right.
\tag{18}
$$

In the specific case of a plane wave propagating along the reference z axis, i.e. for $\beta = \pm 90$ deg, eq. (8) and eq. (10) yield

$$
\left\{
\begin{array}{rcl}
\mathcal{K}_{yy} & = & -\mathcal{K}_{xx}, \\[2ex]
\mathcal{K}_{xz} & = & 0, \\[2ex]
\mathcal{K}_{yz} & = & 0.
\end{array}
\right.
\tag{19}
$$

Thus, eq. (18) reduces to the well known result (Nelson & Chau 1982; Ivashchenko 1987; Ismaiel & Saad 2011)

$$
\left\{
\begin{array}{rcl}
A_x & = & h_1 x + h_2 y, \\[2ex]
A_y & = & h_2 x - h_1 y, \\[2ex]
A_z & = & 0.
\end{array}
\right.
\tag{20}
$$

---

[6] Notice that eq. (18) has a singularity for $\beta = 0$, i.e. for a wave traveling in the reference $\{x, y\}$ plane.

For $\beta = 0$, i.e. for $\hat{k}_z = 0$, eq. (7) reduces to[7]

$$\begin{cases} A_x &= h_1\left(x - y\cot\lambda\right) + h_2 z, \\ A_y &= -\cot\lambda\left[h_1\left(x - y\cot\lambda\right) + h_2 z\right], \\ A_z &= h_1 z\left(\frac{\cos 2\lambda}{\sin^2\lambda}\right) + h_2\left(x - y\cot\lambda\right) \end{cases} \tag{21}$$

because of eq. (12), eq. (13) and eq. (17). Notice that eq. (21) is not singular for $\hat{\boldsymbol{k}} = \{0, \pm 1, 0\}$, and $A_x \neq 0, A_y = 0, A_z \neq 0$, as it is expected for a plane wave.

Finally, for a wave traveling along the reference x axis eq. (7), with eq. (15) and eq. (16), becomes

$$\begin{cases} A_x &= 0, \\ A_y &= h_1 y + h_2 z, \\ A_z &= h_2 y - h_1 z. \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

In Section 3 we will analytically work out the effects of eq. (7) on the trajectory of a test particle orbiting a central body with gravitational parameter GM, where G is the Newtonian gravitational constant and M is its mass, located at the origin of the Fermi frame traversed by a monochromatic plane gravitational wave. We will also consider the particular case of of eq. (20) ($\hat{\boldsymbol{k}} = \{0, 0, \pm 1\}$), widely treated in literature.

3. The long-term variations of the Keplerian orbital elements

The typical planetary orbital frequencies n (see eq. (24) below) in the solar system vary from 1.3×10^{-7} Hz (Mercury) to 1.2×10^{-10} Hz (Pluto), corresponding to timescales $P_{\rm b}$ ranging from 7×10^6 s (Mercury) to 8×10^9 s (Pluto). They are much larger than the time required by the light to travel across the spatial extensions of the Sun's planetary orbits, ranging from 2×10^2 s (Mercury) to 2×10^4 s (Pluto). Thus, if we consider the action of a monochromatic plane gravitational wave of frequency ν_g and wave vector $\boldsymbol{k}$, with $k = \nu_g/c$, on a planetary orbit during a time interval Δt comparable to an orbital period $P_{\rm b}$, its phase $\Phi \doteq \nu_g t - \boldsymbol{k}\cdot\boldsymbol{r} = \nu_g[t - (r/c)\cos\alpha]$ can be reasonably approximated by $\Phi \simeq \nu_g t$, independently of the orientation α of $\boldsymbol{k}$ with respect to the planet's position $\boldsymbol{r}$. As previously stated, in the rest of this Section we will assume $\nu_g/n \ll 1$ as well.

---

[7] Notice that eq. (21) has a singularity for $\lambda = 0$, i.e. for a wave traveling along the reference x axis.

The standard Keplerian orbital elements of the orbit of a test particle are the semi-major axis a, the eccentricity e, the inclination I, the longitude of the ascending node Ω, the argument of pericenter ω, and the mean anomaly $\mathcal{M}$. While a and e determine the size and the shape[8], respectively, of the Keplerian ellipse, I, Ω, ω fix its spatial orientation. I is the inclination of the orbital plane to the reference $\{x, y\}$ plane, while Ω is an angle in the $\{x, y\}$ plane counted from a reference x direction to the line of the nodes, which is the intersection of the orbital plane with the $\{x, y\}$ plane. The angle ω lies in the orbital plane: it is counted from the line of the nodes to the pericenter, which is the point of closest approach of the test particle to the primary. In planetary data reduction the longitude of the pericenter $\varpi \doteq \Omega + \omega$ is customarily used: it is a "dogleg" angle. The argument of latitude $u \doteq \omega + f$ is an angle in the orbital plane which reckons the instantaneous position of the test particle along its orbit with respect to the line of the nodes: f is the time-dependent true anomaly. The mean anomaly is defined as

$$\mathcal{M} \doteq n(t - t_p), \tag{23}$$

where

$$n \doteq \sqrt{GM/a^3} \tag{24}$$

is the Keplerian mean motion related to the Keplerian orbital period by $n = 2\pi/P_{\rm b}$, and t_p is the time of passage at the pericenter. In the unperturbed two-body pointlike case, the Keplerian ellipse, characterized by

$$\left\{\begin{array}{lll} x & = & r\left(\cos\Omega\cos u - \sin\Omega\sin u\cos I\right), \\ & & \\ y & = & r\left(\sin\Omega\cos u + \cos\Omega\sin u\cos I\right), \\ & & \\ z & = & r\left(\sin u\sin I\right), \end{array}\right. \tag{25}$$

and

$$r = \frac{a(1-e^2)}{1+e\cos f}, \tag{26}$$

neither varies its shape nor its size; its orientation is fixed in space as well.

A small perturbing acceleration $\boldsymbol{A}$ of the Newtonian monopole, like eq. (7), induces slow temporal changes of the osculating Keplerian orbital elements The Gauss equations for their variation, valid for quite general perturbations, are (Bertotti et al. 2003)

---

[8] The eccentricity e is a numerical parameter for which $0 \leq e < 1$ holds; $e = 0$ corresponds to a circle.

$$\left\{\begin{array}{lll}\frac{da}{dt} & = & \frac{2}{n\sqrt{1-e^2}}\left[eA_R\sin f+A_T\left(\frac{p}{r}\right)\right],\\ \frac{de}{dt} & = & \frac{\sqrt{1-e^2}}{na}\left\{A_R\sin f+A_T\left[\cos f+\frac{1}{e}\left(1-\frac{r}{a}\right)\right]\right\},\\ \frac{dI}{dt} & = & \frac{1}{na\sqrt{1-e^2}}A_N\left(\frac{r}{a}\right)\cos u,\\ \frac{d\Omega}{dt} & = & \frac{1}{na\sin I\sqrt{1-e^2}}A_N\left(\frac{r}{a}\right)\sin u,\\ \frac{d\varpi}{dt} & = & \frac{\sqrt{1-e^2}}{nae}\left[-A_R\cos f+A_T\left(1+\frac{r}{p}\right)\sin f\right]+2\sin^2\left(\frac{I}{2}\right)\frac{d\Omega}{dt},\\ \frac{d\mathcal{M}}{dt} & = & n-\frac{2}{na}A_R\left(\frac{r}{a}\right)-\sqrt{1-e^2}\left(\frac{d\omega}{dt}+\cos I\frac{d\Omega}{dt}\right).\end{array}\right. \tag{27}$$

In eq. (27) $p \doteq a(1-e^2)$ is the semi-latus rectum, and A_R, A_T, A_N are the radial, transverse and out-of-plane components of the disturbing acceleration $\boldsymbol{A}$, respectively. They have to be computed onto the unperturbed Keplerian ellipse according to

$$\left\{\begin{array}{lll}A_R & = & \boldsymbol{A}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{R}},\\ A_T & = & \boldsymbol{A}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{T}},\\ A_N & = & \boldsymbol{A}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{N}},\end{array}\right. \tag{28}$$

where the unit vectors along the radial, transverse and out-of-plane directions are

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{R}}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}\cos\Omega\cos u-\cos I\sin\Omega\sin u,\\ \sin\Omega\cos u+\cos I\cos\Omega\sin u,\\ \sin I\sin u,\end{array}\right. \tag{29}$$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}-\cos\Omega\sin u-\cos I\sin\Omega\cos u,\\ -\sin\Omega\sin u+\cos I\cos\Omega\cos u,\\ \sin I\cos u,\end{array}\right. \tag{30}$$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{N}}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}\sin I\sin\Omega,\\ -\sin I\cos\Omega,\\ \cos I.\end{array}\right. \tag{31}$$

In the case of eq. (18) and eq. (20), it turns out that it is computationally more convenient to use the eccentric anomaly E instead of the true anomaly f. Basically, E can be regarded as a parametrization of the usual polar angle θ in the orbital plane, being defined as $\mathcal{M} = E - e\sin E$. To this aim, useful conversion relations are (Bertotti et al. 2003)

$$\left\{\begin{array}{lll}\cos f & = & \frac{\cos E - e}{1 - e\cos E},\\[2ex] \sin f & = & \frac{\sqrt{1-e^2}\sin E}{1-e\cos E},\\[2ex] r & = & a(1 - e\cos E),\\[2ex] dt & = & \left(\frac{1 - e\cos E}{n}\right) dE.\end{array}\right. \tag{32}$$

3.1. Monochromatic plane gravitational wave propagating along a generic direction

Straightforward calculation[9] yield the long-term, i.e. averaged over one orbital period, variations of all the Keplerian orbital elements of the test particle due to eq. (7). They are

$$
\left\{
\begin{array}{lcl}
\frac{da}{dt} & = & 0, \\
\frac{de}{dt} & = & \frac{5e\sqrt{1-e^2}}{16n}\{-8\sin I\cos 2\omega\left(\mathcal{K}_{xz}\cos\Omega+\mathcal{K}_{yz}\sin\Omega\right)+ \\
& + & 4\cos I\cos 2\omega\left[-2\mathcal{K}_{xy}\cos 2\Omega+\left(\mathcal{K}_{xx}-\mathcal{K}_{yy}\right)\sin 2\Omega\right]+ \\
& + & \sin 2\omega\Big[\left(\mathcal{K}_{xx}-\mathcal{K}_{yy}\right)\left(3+\cos 2I\right)\cos 2\Omega+6\left(\mathcal{K}_{xx}+\mathcal{K}_{yy}\right)\sin^2 I+ \\
& + & 4\sin 2I\left(\mathcal{K}_{xz}\sin\Omega-\mathcal{K}_{yz}\cos\Omega\right)+2\mathcal{K}_{xy}\left(3+\cos 2I\right)\sin 2\Omega]\}, \\
\frac{dI}{dt} & = & \frac{1}{16n\sqrt{1-e^2}}\Big[|4\cos I\Big(2+3e^2+5e^2\cos 2\omega\Big)\left(\mathcal{K}_{xz}\cos\Omega+\mathcal{K}_{yz}\sin\Omega\right)- \\
& - & 2\Big(2+3e^2\Big)\sin I\left[2\mathcal{K}_{xy}\cos 2\Omega+\left(\mathcal{K}_{yy}-\mathcal{K}_{xx}\right)\sin 2\Omega\right]- \\
& - & 10e^2\sin I\cos 2\omega\left[2\mathcal{K}_{xy}\cos 2\Omega+\left(\mathcal{K}_{yy}-\mathcal{K}_{xx}\right)\sin 2\Omega\right]+ \\
& + & 5e^2\sin 2\omega\{4\cos 2I\left(\mathcal{K}_{yz}\cos\Omega-\mathcal{K}_{xz}\sin\Omega\right)+ \\
& + & \sin 2I\left[-3\left(\mathcal{K}_{xx}+\mathcal{K}_{yy}\right)+\left(\mathcal{K}_{xx}-\mathcal{K}_{yy}\right)\cos 2\Omega+2\mathcal{K}_{xy}\sin 2\Omega\right]\}|], \\
\frac{d\Omega}{dt} & = & -\frac{1}{8n\sqrt{1-e^2}}\Big\{2\cos 2I\csc I\Big(-2-3e^2+5e^2\cos 2\omega\Big)\left(\mathcal{K}_{yz}\cos\Omega-\mathcal{K}_{xz}\sin\Omega\right)+ \\
& + & \cos I\Big(-2-3e^2+5e^2\cos 2\omega\Big)\left[-3\left(\mathcal{K}_{xx}+\mathcal{K}_{yy}\right)+\left(\mathcal{K}_{xx}-\mathcal{K}_{yy}\right)\cos 2\Omega+2\mathcal{K}_{xy}\sin 2\Omega\right]+ \\
& + & 5e^2\sin 2\omega\left[2\mathcal{K}_{xy}\cos 2\Omega-2\cot I\left(\mathcal{K}_{xz}\cos\Omega+\mathcal{K}_{yz}\sin\Omega\right)+\left(\mathcal{K}_{yy}-\mathcal{K}_{xx}\right)\sin 2\Omega\right]\Big\}, \\
\frac{d\varpi}{dt} & = & \frac{1}{16n\sqrt{1-e^2}}\Big\{-3\left(\mathcal{K}_{xx}+\mathcal{K}_{yy}\right)\left(1-4\cos I+\cos 2I\right)\Big(-2-3e^2+5e^2\cos 2\omega\Big)+ \\
& + & \left(\cos I-2\right)\cos 2\Omega\Big[2\left(\mathcal{K}_{xx}-\mathcal{K}_{yy}\right)\cos I\Big(-2-3e^2+5e^2\cos 2\omega\Big)+20e^2\mathcal{K}_{xy}\sin 2\omega\Big]+ \\
& + & 2\left(\cos I-2\right)\cos\Omega\csc I\Big[2\mathcal{K}_{yz}\cos 2I\Big(-2-3e^2+5e^2\cos 2\omega\Big)-10e^2\mathcal{K}_{xz}\cos I\sin 2\omega\Big]+ \\
& + & 2\left(\cos I-2\right)\sin\Omega\csc I\Big[-2\mathcal{K}_{xz}\cos 2I\Big(-2-3e^2+5e^2\cos 2\omega\Big)-10e^2\mathcal{K}_{yz}\cos I\sin 2\omega\Big]+ \\
& + & 2\left(\cos I-2\right)\sin 2\Omega\Big[2\mathcal{K}_{xy}\cos I\Big(-2-3e^2+5e^2\cos 2\omega\Big)+5e^2\left(\mathcal{K}_{yy}-\mathcal{K}_{xx}\right)\sin 2\omega\Big]\Big\}, \\
\frac{d\mathcal{M}}{dt} & = n+ & \frac{1}{32n}\Big\{8\Big[-7-3e^2+5\Big(1+e^2\Big)\cos 2\omega\Big]\sin 2I\left(\mathcal{K}_{yz}\cos\Omega-\mathcal{K}_{xz}\sin\Omega\right)- \\
& - & 80\Big(1+e^2\Big)\sin I\sin 2\omega\left(\mathcal{K}_{xz}\cos\Omega+\mathcal{K}_{yz}\sin\Omega\right)+ \\
& + & 2\cos 2I\Big[-7-3e^2+5\Big(1+e^2\Big)\cos 2\omega\Big]\left[3\left(\mathcal{K}_{xx}+\mathcal{K}_{yy}\right)+\left(\mathcal{K}_{yy}-\mathcal{K}_{xx}\right)\cos 2\Omega-2\mathcal{K}_{xy}\sin 2\Omega\right]- \\
& - & 2\Big[7+3e^2+5\Big(1+e^2\Big)\cos 2\omega\Big]\left[\mathcal{K}_{xx}+\mathcal{K}_{yy}+\left(\mathcal{K}_{xx}-\mathcal{K}_{yy}\right)\cos 2\Omega+2\mathcal{K}_{xy}\sin 2\Omega\right]- \\
& - & 40\Big(1+e^2\Big)\cos I\sin 2\omega\left[2\mathcal{K}_{xy}\cos 2\Omega+\left(\mathcal{K}_{yy}-\mathcal{K}_{xx}\right)\sin 2\Omega\right]\Big\}.
\end{array}
\right.
\tag{33}
$$

In order to deal with manageable expressions of general validity, we did not display in eq. (33) the explicit expressions of the tidal matrix coefficients in terms of β and λ; The result of eq. (33) is exact both in e and in I in the sense that no *a priori* simplifying assumptions about the eccentricity and the inclination of the perturbed test particle's orbit were assumed in the calculation. It can be noticed that the semi-major axis is not affected by the passage of a very slowly varying gravitational wave; the variation of the eccentricity is proportional to e itself, so that a circular orbit does not change its shape. Moreover, eq. (33) does not contain secular effects because of the presence of I, Ω, ω which, actually, experience slow changes[10] in time as far as the planets of the solar system are concerned. A further modulation is due to the coefficients $\mathcal{K}_{ij}$ of the tidal matrix containing the (slow) harmonic variation of the impinging gravitational wave. Since all such frequencies are much smaller than the typical orbital ones for the Sun's planet, the terms containing them were kept fixed in the integration yielding eq. (33).

---

[9] We do not explicitly show here the analytical expressions for A_R, A_T, A_N due to eq. (18) because they are rather cumbersome.

3.2. Monochromatic plane gravitational wave propagating along a the z axis

By using the same procedure it is possible to work out the long-term variations of the Keplerian orbital elements for a direction of incidence of the wave coinciding with the reference z axis. By using eq. (20) one gets

$$\left\{\begin{array}{lcl}
\frac{da}{dt} & = & 0, \\
\frac{de}{dt} & = & \frac{5e\sqrt{1-e^2}\left[-8\cos I\cos 2\omega(h_2\cos 2\Omega - h_1\sin 2\Omega)+2(3+\cos 2I)\sin 2\omega(h_1\cos 2\Omega+h_2\sin 2\Omega)\right]}{16n}, \\
\frac{dI}{dt} & = & \frac{\sin I\left[-\left(2+3e^2+5e^2\cos 2\omega\right)(h_2\cos 2\Omega-h_1\sin 2\Omega)+5e^2\cos I\sin 2\omega(h_1\cos 2\Omega+h_2\sin 2\Omega)\right]}{4n\sqrt{1-e^2}}, \\
\frac{d\Omega}{dt} & = & -\frac{5e^2\sin 2\omega(h_2\cos 2\Omega-h_1\sin 2\Omega)+\cos I\left(-2-3e^2+5e^2\cos 2\omega\right)(h_1\cos 2\Omega+h_2\sin 2\Omega)}{4n\sqrt{1-e^2}}, \\
\frac{d\varpi}{dt} & = & \frac{1}{32n\sqrt{1-e^2}}\left\{-40\left[e^2+(e^2-2)\cos I\right]\sin 2\omega\left(h_2\cos 2\Omega-h_1\sin 2\Omega\right)+\right., \\
 & + & 20\left(3-2e^2-2e^2\cos I+\cos 2I\right)\cos 2\omega\left(h_1\cos 2\Omega+h_2\sin 2\Omega\right)+ \\
 & + & \left.16\left(3-3e^2+5\cos I\right)\sin^2\left(\frac{I}{2}\right)\left(h_1\cos 2\Omega+h_2\sin 2\Omega\right)\right\}, \\
\frac{d\mathcal{M}}{dt} & = & n+\frac{1}{32n}\left[-80\left(1+e^2\right)\cos I\sin 2\omega\left(h_2\cos 2\Omega-h_1\sin 2\Omega\right)-\right. \\
 & - & 20\left(1+e^2\right)\left(3+\cos 2I\right)\cos 2\omega\left(h_1\cos 2\Omega+h_2\sin 2\Omega\right)- \\
 & - & \left.8\left(7+3e^2\right)\sin^2 I\left(h_1\cos 2\Omega+h_2\sin 2\Omega\right)\right].
\end{array}\right. \tag{34}$$

Also in this case, no a priori assumptions on e and I were made, so that the rates of eq. (34) are exact in this respect. Notice that for $I = 0$, i.e. for incidence of the gravitational wave normal to the orbital plane, the inclination is left unaffected. Moreover, also in this case, the elements h_1 and h_2 of the tidal matrix, which are (slowly) time-varying harmonic functions whose amplitudes are proportional to ν_g^2, were assumed constant in the integrations over the planet's orbital period.

---

[10] They are mainly due to the mutual N−body classical perturbations: the rates of change can be found at http://ssd.jpl.nasa.gov/txt/p_elem_t1.txt.

Notice that, for a plane wave traveling along the z axis, i.e. for eq. (19), eq. (33) reduces just to eq. (34). It is straightforward to obtain the formulas valid also for the other specific directions of propagation examined in Section 2 by suitably specializing eq. (33) to such cases (cfr. eq. (12), eq. (13) and eq. (15)).

3.3. A comment on the approximation used for the harmonic wave functions

In obtaining eq. (33) and eq. (34) we kept the tidal matrix coefficients, which include the time-dependent harmonic functions of the wave, constant in the integrations over one orbital revolution of the test particle. This implies that we considered waves having frequencies ν_g much smaller than the orbital ones n. As we will see in Section 4, it is in contrast with the other approaches followed so far in literature, in which no similar assumptions on ν_g were made. Apart from the fact that, from a computational point of view, our approach allows for exact calculations in e and I, our choice is justified also from a phenomenological point of view. Indeed, applying our results to the solar system implies that we could, in principle, put constraints over a part of the ultra-low frequency spectrum of gravitational waves for which neither ground-based nor space-based dedicated experimental devices are available[11]. Moreover, in view of continuous tracking of planets by means of ranging either directly to their surfaces or to ever more numerous orbiting spacecraft it will be possible, in principle, to obtain more and more accurate bounds because of increasing data records over the years. On the other hand, it is, after all, of little practical utility to perform cumbersome calculations of the wave-induced orbital effects involving frequencies as large as, or even larger than, the planet's ones since much more accurate dedicated experiments already exist covering such windows of the spectrum of gravitational waves. Indeed, the accuracy reachable in future planned interplanetary laser ranging facilities (Smith et al. 2006; Turyshev & Williams 2007; Merkowitz et al. 2007), of the order of about $1 - 10$ cm, is not comparable with that of the latest gravitational wave detectors; it can be acceptable in order to put upper bounds when no other, more accurate devices exist, as for the ultra-low frequency waves.

---

[11] A possible exception may be the proposed Inflation Probe by NASA (Benford et al. 2009), dedicated to map the polarization of the Cosmic Microwave Background at 10^{-16} Hz (see Figure 1 of Prince et al. (2010)). Notice also that precision timing of millisecond pulsars may be used for gravitational waves in the range $10^{-7} - 10^{-9}$ Hz. (Kopeikin 1997; Hand 2010; Jenet et al. 2011).

4. Confrontation with other approaches in literature

In this Section we briefly outline the approaches followed by some other researchers, with particular care to the orbital effects caused by the traveling wave.

Rudenko (1975) uses polar coordinates in the orbital plane and considers an orbit disturbed by a monochromatic plane gravitational wave traveling along a generic direction; the additional force resulting on the test particle is obtained within the linear approximation of general relativity (within the framework of the "theory of gravitation in plane space" by Zel'dovich & Novikov (1967)). Then, Rudenko (1975) assumes a normally incident wave and solves the equations of motion at zero order in eccentricity. Finally, he studies the variation of the orbital radius Δr for various values of the wave's frequency.

Turner (1979) works in the TT gauge by deriving the geodesic equations of motion in cartesian coordinates of both the binary system's constituents. Then, he takes their difference obtaining the equations for their relative motion. It turns out that they are formally different from those obtained by other authors like, e.g., Mashhoon (1978) from the geodesic deviation equation, but Turner (1979) shows that they are, actually, equal up to an unphysical coordinate transformation. In the scenario by Turner (1979), the monochromatic plane wave travels along the negative z direction. He uses the Gaussian perturbative scheme to work out the temporal changes over one orbital revolution of the semi-major axis and the eccentricity of a circular orbit by setting $\Omega = \varpi = I = 0$. Then, he discards the limitation $I = 0$, but not the other ones. Finally, Turner (1979) considers non-circular orbits, and computes the variation of a to the lowest order in e for $\Omega = I = \varpi = 0$. In all of such cases, he takes different values for ν_g/n.

Mashhoon et al. (1981), relying upon the methods developed in Mashhoon (1978), look at the effects that various kinds of gravitational radiation, among which monochromatic plane waves are considered as well, have on a Newtonian binary system. Let us recall that Mashhoon (1978), in considering slow particle motions and weak waves having wavelengths larger than the system's orbital size, adopts the linearized Jacobi equation for the geodesic deviation equation. Mashhoon (1978) writes down the equations of motion in cylindrical coordinates and solve them for various values of ν_g with respect to n. As far as the monochromatic plane wave case is concerned, also Mashhoon et al. (1981) assume that its wavelength is much larger than the size of the binary system; no simplifying assumptions on the wave's frequency are made. Then, Mashhoon et al. (1981) work out the resulting relative change $\Delta r/r$ occurring in the test particle's distance from the primary in the low-eccentricity approximation. Moreover, Mashhoon et al. (1981) consider also the case of a pair of planets moving in the same plane along circular orbits, and calculate the wave-induced relative change $\Delta\mathcal{R}/\mathcal{R}$ in their mutual distance.

Nelson & Chau (1982) look in the TT gauge at a monochromatic plane gravitational wave traveling along the z axis, and having wavelength much larger than the size of the system considered. They write down the components of the wave-induced acceleration experienced by the test particle in cylindrical coordinates for generic shape and inclination of the orbit. Then, they specialize them to the case of normally incident wave, i.e. for an orbit with zero inclination. At this point, Nelson & Chau (1982) solve the resulting perturbed equations of motion by evaluating the radial change Δr over one orbital revolution. In their computation, they resort to some approximations in e, and do not consider the harmonic wave functions constant over typical orbital timescales. The resulting changes for different values of ν_g/n are inspected. Then, Nelson & Chau (1982) examine the case of a generic inclination of the test particle's orbit by working out the shift along the wave's propagation, i.e. along the z axis. Finally, Nelson & Chau (1982) perform some numerical analyses of the radial shifts for different values of the eccentricity and of the phases of the wave.

Also Ivashchenko (1987) considers the case of a monochromatic plane gravitational wave, in the TT gauge, traveling along the z axis. He assumes that its wavelength is much larger than the characteristic size of the perturbed system, so that he can neglect the term $\boldsymbol{k}\cdot\boldsymbol{r}$ in the wave's phase. On the other hand, Ivashchenko (1987) does not make any a priori assumptions about the magnitude of the wave's frequency ν_g with respect to the orbital one n. After having obtained the exact radial, transverse and normal components of the perturbing acceleration from its expression in cartesian coordinates, Ivashchenko (1987) makes use of the Gauss equations for the variation of all the Keplerian orbital elements, apart from the mean anomaly. At this point, after having set $\omega = 0$, he makes an expansion of the right-hand sides of the Gauss equations, evaluated onto the unperturbed Keplerian ellipse, to first order in e by using the mean anomaly $\mathcal{M}$ as independent variable. Thus, in view of eq. (23), Ivashchenko (1987) obtains approximate expressions of the form

$$\frac{d\xi}{dt} = \mathfrak{F}(t),\ \xi = a, e, I, \Omega, \omega, \tag{35}$$

which he straightforwardly integrates. In doing that, he does not consider h_1 and h_2 as constant by keeping, instead, their harmonic time dependence. Then, Ivashchenko (1987) discusses various particular cases for different orbital geometries and, especially, for different values of ν_g/n.

Also Kochkin & Sbytov (1987) adopt a wave in TT gauge traveling along the reference z axis. Moreover, they assume for it a circular polarization, and do not make any assumptions about the wave's frequency and its wavelength. Kochkin & Sbytov (1987) use cylindrical coordinates to write down the spacetime line element for a linearized superposition of the Schwarzschild and wave fields, from which the particle's equations of motion are obtained. Concerning the orbital geometry, they put the perturbed orbit, not assumed a priori circular, in the reference $\{x, y\}$ plane, so that $\boldsymbol{k}\cdot\boldsymbol{r} = 0$. Then, Kochkin & Sbytov (1987) do not recur to any known perturbative schemes, like, e.g., the Gauss and the Lagrange equations (Bertotti et al. 2003), in dealing with the resulting equations of motion. After some changes of variables, they integrate the resulting modified equations over one orbital revolution by inferring the cumulative changes of the semi-major axis, the eccentricity and the pericenter after one orbital period. Finally, Kochkin & Sbytov (1987) consider how the results they obtained vary for different values of ν_g/n; they consider the circular case as well.

Chicone et al. (1996a) and Chicone et al. (1996b) look at the action of a monochromatic plane gravitational wave traveling along the reference z axis and normally impinging on an unperturbed two-body system. The wave's wavelength is assumed to be much larger than the semi-major axis of the orbit, and the characteristic velocities within the system are much smaller than c. No assumptions are made a priori on the wave's frequency ν_g. The resulting relative acceleration is obtained from the geodesic deviation equation in cartesian coordinates. Then, Chicone et al. (1996a) and Chicone et al. (1996b) write down the Hamiltonian of the perturbed system in polar coordinates, and adopt the Delaunay orbital elements L, G, ℓ, g for a non-circular orbit. Fourier series expansions in terms of the mean anomaly are performed. Different values for ν_g/n and wave's polarizations are, then, considered.

Chicone & Mashhoon (2002), after having generalized the Jacobi equation by taking into account also the relative velocity of the geodesics, consider a monochromatic plane gravitational wave traveling along the reference x axis of the local Fermi quasi-inertial frame. Chicone & Mashhoon (2002) write down the resulting equations of motion of the test particle in cartesian coordinates; they are rather involved because of the presence of the non-linear, velocity-dependent terms. Then, Chicone & Mashhoon (2002) study the motion of the test particle along the x axis itself.

The general wave-binary system scenario adopted by Ismaiel & Saad (2011) is analogous to that by, e.g., Ivashchenko (1987). However, after having written the components of the tidal-type wave acceleration in cartesian coordinates, Ismaiel & Saad (2011) obtain a potential function $\mathcal{R}$ from them in order to use the perturbative scheme based on the Lagrange planetary equations (Bertotti et al. 2003) for all the Keplerian orbital elements, apart from $\mathcal{M}$. Then, they evaluate $\mathcal{R}$ onto the unperturbed Keplerian ellipse, without fixing ω, and expand it to some, unspecified, order in e by using the mean anomaly a independent variable. In such a way, they obtain that the right-hand sides of the Lagrange equations depend only on t, which allows Ismaiel & Saad (2011) to integrate them over one orbital period. Notice that they do not keep the wave's harmonic function constant in the integration. Finally, they compute the long-term changes of[12] a, e, I, Ω, ω of Venus and Pluto for three, unspecified, different sources of gravitational waves.

---

[12] It is unclear if the figures in Table III of Ismaiel & Saad (2011) refer to the rates of change of the Keplerian orbital elements, i.e. if they are m s^{-1} and deg s^{-1}, or to their shifts over one orbital period, i.e. if they are m and deg. Also the units adopted in Table III of Ismaiel & Saad (2011) are unspecified.

5. Summary and conclusions

We analytically worked out the long-term variations of all the six Keplerian orbital elements of a test particle orbiting a central body due to the perturbing tidal acceleration induced by the passage through the system of a monochromatic plane gravitational wave. We assumed that its frequency is much smaller than the orbital frequency of the test particle, so that the time-dependent harmonic functions of the wave were kept constant in the integrations performed over one orbital period. We considered a generic direction of the wavevector.

We obtained that all the Keplerian orbital elements, apart from the semi-major axis, undergo long-term variations. They are linear combinations of the non-vanishing elements of the tidal matrix, containing the slowly time-varying harmonic terms due to the wave, with coefficients which are complicated functions of the eccentricity, the inclination, the node and the pericenter of the test particle. We did not make any a priori simplifying assumptions concerning the inclination and the eccentricity of the test particle's orbit, thus obtaining exact results as far as such a point is concerned. The variation of the eccentricity is proportional to the eccentricity itself, so that circular orbits do not change their shape. In the case of incidence normal to the orbital plane, also the inclination is left unaffected.

From a practical point of view, in the most general case one has six unknowns: the two angles of the wavevector, the frequency of the wave, its two independent amplitudes, and a phase lag. In principle, it is possible to constrain all of them by determining the secular variations of some Keplerian orbital elements for, e.g., several planets of the solar system. Actually, this seems to be the current trend in astronomical research since extensive planetary data reductions, in which the corrections to the standard precessions of the perihelia and the nodes of some major bodies of the solar system are estimated, are currently ongoing by independent teams of astronomers. Future implementation of planned or proposed accurate interplanetary ranging facilities may further enhance such a program. It should also be considered that no other dedicated experiments are currently available for the ultra-low frequency part of the spectrum of gravitational waves.

Our results are quite general since they are valid not only for the solar system's planets, but also for any generic gravitationally bound two-body systems whose characteristic orbital frequencies are quite larger than the incident wave's frequency. Moreover, they can be extended to any generic perturbing acceleration of tidal type with constant coefficients over the characteristic timescales of the perturbed system.

REFERENCES

Abbott B. P., et al., 2009, Reports on Progress in Physics, 72, 076901

Abramovici A., Althouse W. E., Drever R. W. P., Gürsel Y., Kawamura S., Raab F. J., Shoemaker D., Sievers L., Spero R. E., Thorne K. S., 1992, Science, 256, 325

Acernese A., et al., 2004, Class. Quantum Grav., 21, S385

Anderson A. J., 1971, Nature, 229, 547

Arai K., and the TAMA collaboration , 2008, Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 120, 032010

Armstrong J. W., 2006, Living Rev. Relativity 9, 1. URL (cited on 24 April 2011): http://www.livingreviews.org/lrr-2006-1

Benford D., Moseley H., Zmuidzinas J., 2009, J. Phys.: Conf. Ser., 155, 012001

Bertotti B., 1973, Astrophysical Letters, 14, 51

Bertotti B., Carr B. J., 1989, ApJ, 236, 1000

Bertotti B., Farinella P., Vokrouhlický D., 2003, Physics of the Solar System, Kluwer Academic Press, Dordrecht

Bradaschia C., del Fabbro R., di Virgilio A., Giazotto A., Kautzky H., Montelatici V., Passuello D., Brillet A., Cregut O., Hello P., Man C. N., Manh P. T., Marraud A., Shoemaker D., Vinet J. Y., Barone F., di Fiore L., Milano L., Russo G., Aguirregabiria J. M., Bel H., Duruisseau J. P., Le Denmat G., Tourrenc Ph., Capozzi M., Longo M., Lops M., Pinto I., Rotoli G., Damour T., Bonazzola S., Marck J. A., Gourghoulon Y., Holloway L. E., Fuligni F., Iafolla V., Natale G., 1990, Nucl. Instr. Meth. Phys. Res. A, 289, 518

Carr B. J., 1980, Astron. Astrophys., 89, 6

Cerdonio M., 2003, Nuclear Physics B Proceedings Supplements, 114, 81

Chicone C., Mashhoon B., Retzloff D. G., 1996, Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Physique Théorique, 64, 87

Chicone C., Mashhoon B., Retzloff D. G., 1996b, J. Math. Phys., 37, 3997

Chicone C., Mashhoon B., 2002, Class. Quant. Grav., 19, 4231

Corda C., 2009a, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D., 18, 2275

Corda C., 2009b, Will Gravitational Waves Confirm Einstein's General Relativity? In: NUMERICAL ANALYSIS AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS: International Conference on Numerical Analysis and Applied Mathematics 2009: Volume 1 and Volume 2. AIP Conference Proceedings, 1168, pp. 1090-1093 (2009)

Danzmann K., et al., 1992, The Geo-Project. A Long-Baseline Laser Interferometer for the Detection of Gravitational Waves. In: Ehlers J., Schäfer G. (eds.), Relativistic Gravity Research, Proceedings of the 81 WE-Heraeus-Seminar Held at the Physikzentrum Bad Honnef, Germany, 2-6 September 1991. Lecture Notes in Physics, 410, Springer, Berlin, p. 184

Einstein A., 1916, Sitzungsber. K. Preuss. Akad. Wiss., 688

Einstein A., 1918, Sitzungsber. K. Preuss. Akad. Wiss., 154

Fabbri R., Pollock M. 1983, Phys. Lett. B, 125, 445

Fairhurst S., Guidi G. M., Hello P., Whelan J. T., Woan G., 2011, Gen. Relativ. Gravit., 43, 387

Fermi E., 1922, Atti Acad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Nat., 31, 21, 51

Futamase T., Matsuda T., 1979, Prog. Theor. Phys., 61, 86

Giazotto A., 2008, Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 120, 032002

Grishchuk L. P., Polnarev A. G., 1980, Gravitational Waves and Their Interaction with Matter and Fields. In: Held A. (ed.), General Relativity and Gravitation, Plenum Press, new York, p. 393

Grishchuk L. P. 1993, Phys. Rev. D, 48, 3513

Grote H., and the LIGO Scientific Collaboration, 2008, Class. Quantum Grav., 25, 114043

Hand E., 2010, Nature, 463, 147

Hodgkinson D. E., 1972, Gen. Rel. Grav., 3, 351

Hogan C. J. 1986, MNRAS, 218, 629

Hulse R. A., Taylor J. H., 1975, Astrophys. J. Lett., 195, L51

Ismaiel M. N., Saad N. A., 2011, The Open Astron. J., 4, 1

Ivashchenko A. V., 1987, Sov. Astron., 31, 76

Jenet F. A., Armstrong J. W., Tinto M., 2011, Phys. Rev. D, 83, 081301(R)

Kochkin R. A., Sbytov Yu. G., 1987, Sov. Astron., 31, 537

Kopeikin S. M., 1997, Phys. Rev. D, 56, 4455

Levi-Civita T., 1926, Math. Ann., 97, 291

Linet B, 1982a, Gen. Relativ. Gravit., 14, 479

Linet B, 1982b, Phys. Lett. A, 92, 63

Mashhoon B., 1975, ApJ, 197, 705

Mashhoon B., 1977, ApJ, 216, 591

Mashhoon B., 1978, ApJ, 223, 285

Mashhoon B., 1979, ApJ, 227, 1019

Mashhoon B., Grishchuk L. P., 1980, ApJ, 236, 990

Mashhoon B., Carr B. J., Hu B. L., 1981, ApJ, 246, 569

Men J.-R., Ni W.-T., Wang G., 2010, Chinese Astronomy and Astrophysics, 34, 434

Merkowitz S. M., Dabney P. W., Livas J. C., McGarry J. F., Neumann G. A., Zagwodzki T. W., 2007, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D, 16, 2151

Nelson L. A., Chau W. Y., 1982, ApJ, 254, 735

Ni, W.-T., 2009, Class. Quantum Grav., 26, 075021

Padmanabhan T., 2010, Gravitation. Foundations and Frontiers, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Pirani F. A. E., 1956, Acta Phys. Polonica, 15, 389

Plowman J. E., Jacobs D. C., Hellings R. W., Larson S. L., Tsuruta S., 2010, MNRAS, 401, 2706

Povoleri A., Kemble S., 2006. LISA Orbits. In: Merkowitz S.M., Livas J.C. (Eds.), LASER INTERFEROMETER SPACE ANTENNA: Sixth International LISA Symposium. AIP Conference Proceedings, vol. 873. American Institute of Physics, New York, pp. 702706

Prince T. A. for the LISA International Science Team, 2010, The Promise of Low-Frequency Gravitational Wave Astronomy, Astro2010: The Astronomy and Astrophysics Decadal Survey, Science White Papers, no. 238

Rubakov V. A., Sazhin M., Veriaskin A. V. 1982, Phys. Lett. B, 115, 189

Rudenko V. N., 1975, Sov. Astron., 19, 270

Sathyaprakash B. S., Schutz B. F., 2009, Living Rev. Relativity 12, 2, URL (cited on 6 April 2011): http://www.livingreviews.org/lrr-2009-2

Sesana A., Gair J., Berti E., Volonteri M., 2011, Phys. Rev. D, 83, 044036

Shaddock D. A., 2008, Class. Quantum Grav., 25, 114012

Smith D. E., Zuber M. T., Sun X., Neumann G. A., Cavanaugh J. F., McGarry J. F., Zagwodzki T. W., 2006, Science, 311, 53

Synge J. L., 1926, Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London A, 226, 31

Synge J. L., 1960, Relativity: The General Theory, North-Holland, Amsterdam

Takahashi R., and the TAMA Collaboration, 2004, Class. Quantum Grav., 21, S403

Torres G., Winn J. N., Holman M. J., 2008, Astrophys. J., 677, 1324

Tsubono K., 1995, 300-m laser interferometer gravitational wave detector (TAMA300) in Japan. In: Coccia E., Pizzella G., Ronga F., Edoardo Amaldi Conference on Gravitational Wave Experiments, World Scientific, Singapore, pp. 112-114

Turner M. S., 1979, ApJ, 233, 685

Turyshev S. G., Williams J. G., 2007, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D, 16, 2165

Vilenkin A. 1981, Phys. Lett. B, 107, 47

Vinet J. Y., 1993, A Short Review of the VIRGO Project. In: Tran Thanh Van J., Damour T., Hinds E., Wilkerson J. (eds.), Perspectives in Neutrinos Atomic Physics and Gravitation, Proceedings of the XXVIIIth Rencontre de Moriond, 30 January-6 February, 1993, Villars sur Ollon, Switzerland. Editions Frontieres, Gif-sur-Yvette, p.491

Weber J., 1961, General Relativity and Gravitational Waves, Interscience, New York

Wheeler J. A., 1962, Geometrodynamics, Academic Press, New York

Xia Y., Li G., Heinzel G., Rüdiger A., Luo Y., 2010, Science China Physics, Mechanics and Astronomy, 53, 179

Zel'dovich Ya. B., Novikov I. D., 1967, Relativistic Astrophysics, Nauka, Moscow

Zel'dovich Ya. B., Novikov I. D., 1975, Structure and Evolution of the Universe, Nauka, Moscow

---

This manuscript was prepared with the AAS LaTeX macros v5.2.